



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,208	10/23/2003	Robert J. Schmonsees	2563-0006	5632

42624 7590 10/10/2006

DAVIDSON BERQUIST JACKSON & GOWDEY LLP
4300 WILSON BLVD., 7TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SHIH, HAOSHIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2196

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,208

Applicant(s)

SCHMONSEES ET AL.

Examiner

Haoshian Shih

Art Unit

2196

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending in this application and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. As to claim 1, the "presentation slide recorded onto a computer readable medium" such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Qureshi et al. (US 6,084,582) hereafter Qureshi.

7. As to claim 1, Qureshi discloses a presentation slide recorded onto a computer readable medium, comprising: a graphical object (col 4, line 12-14); and two logically different narrations associated with the graphical object (Fig 2, label 222, 224; col 5, line 54-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Barger et al (Annotation for streaming video on the web: System Design and Usage Studies, September 15 1998, Technical Report MSR-TR-98-60) hereafter Barger.

10. As to claim 2, Qureshi does not disclose one of the logically different narrations provides a public narration for the graphical object to be provided to a presentation audience, and the other of the logically different narrations provides a private narration

for the graphical object to be provided to a presenter of the graphical object and not to the presentation audience.

In the same field of endeavor, Barger on discloses one of the logically different narrations (2.3.1; the support of audio annotation reads on narration) provides a public narration for the graphical object to be provided to a presentation audience (2.2.1, paragraph 3; presentation audience group are given the public narration access), and the other of the logically different narrations provides a private narration for the graphical object to be provided to a presenter of the graphical object and not to the presentation audience (2.2.1, paragraph 3; presenter group (in a group of one person) has access to the private narration).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Margeron in order to provide access control to the different narrations (2.2.1, paragraph 3).

11. As to claim 3, Qureshi does not disclose one but not the other of the logically different narrations is playable by any user of the presentation, and the other of the logically different narrations is security protected from disclosure by unauthorized users of the presentations.

In the same field of endeavor, Barger on further discloses one but not the other of the logically different narrations is playable by any user of the presentation (2.3.6, paragraph 1), and the other of the logically different narrations is security protected from disclosure by unauthorized users of the presentations (2.3.6, paragraph 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Barger on in order to provide access control to the different narrations (2.2.1, paragraph 3).

12. As to claim 4, Qureshi discloses a system comprising a graphical object creation system to facilitate the creation of a graphical object to be displayed to an audience (col 4, line 5-7); a narration creation facility communicative with the graphical object creation system to associate two independent audio objects with the graphical object (Fig 2, labels 222, 224; col 5, line 54-65); Qureshi does not disclose a presentation facility to present the graphical object to the audience and one but not the other of the independent audio objects to the audience.

In the same field of endeavor, Barger on discloses a presentation facility to present the graphical object to the audience and one but not the other of the independent audio objects to the audience (2.2.1, paragraph 3; one of the independent audio object can be assigned to the "audience" group, the other independent audio object can be assigned to a different group that the "audience" group does not have access of.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Barger on in order to provide access control to the different narrations (2.2.1, paragraph 3).

13. As to claim 5, Qureshi does not disclose the presentation facility includes a user selection button to enable one of the independent audio objects.

In the same field of endeavor, Barger on discloses the presentation facility includes a user selection button to enable said one of the independent audio objects (2.3.5 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Barger on in order to provide an user interface for the access control to the different narrations (2.2.1, paragraph 3).

14. As to claim 6, Qureshi does not disclose the presentation facility presents the other of the independent audio objects privately to a presenter of the graphical object.

In the same field of endeavor, Barger on discloses the presentation facility presents the other of the independent audio objects privately to a presenter of the graphical object

(2.2.1 paragraph 3; the independent audio object can be assigned to the “presenter” group (which may be a group of one) that may allow access to the “presenter” group only.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Barger on in order to provide access control to the different narrations (2.2.1, paragraph 3).

15. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Phillip (Videodisk players: A multi-purpose audiovisual tool, Phillip, John, Electronic Learning: Nov 1988; 8, 3; Research Library pg.50)

16. As to claim 7, Qureshi discloses a method of presenting a graphical object by a presenter to an audience, comprising: adding two logically different narrations to a single graphical object; displaying the graphical object (col 5, line 54-65). Qureshi does not disclose simultaneously with the display of the graphical object, playing a first of the narrations to the audience and simultaneously with the display of the graphical object, playing a second of the narrations only to the presenter.

In the same field of endeavor, Phillip discloses simultaneously with the display of the graphical object, playing a first of the narrations to the audience (paragraph “Audio

Selection”); and simultaneously with the display of the graphical object, playing a second of the narrations only to the presenter (paragraph “Audio Selection”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Qureshi and the teachings of Philipo in order to provide a multi language translation to the same graphic object or use one narration for teacher training and the other narration for use during presentation to students simultaneously (paragraph “Audio Selection”).

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Liou, Shih-Ping (EP 1 126 721 A1) - System and methods for generating and play back of annotated multimedia presentation

Stuppy et al. (US PUB 2003/0054328 A1) - Learning system for enabling separate teacher-student interaction over selected interactive channels

Paul, Chris (US PUB 2005/0039131 A1) - Presentation management system and method

Nelson et al. (US PUB 2004/0008249 A1) - Method and apparatus for

controllable conference content via back-channel video interface

Gupta et al. (US PUB 2003/0196164 A1) - ANNOTATIONS FOR MULTIPLE
VERSIONS OF MEDIA CONTENT

Milne et al. (US 6,421,692 B1) - object-oriented multimedia [data routing system]
presentation control system

Covington et al. (US 5,524,193) - Interactive multimedia annotation method and
apparatus

Cottrille et al. (US 6,973,616 B1) - Associating annotations with a content source

Lerner et al. (US 6,859,909 B1) - System and method for annotating web-based
documents

Nelson et al. (US PUB 2003/0194062 A1) - Methods and systems for enabling
conversations about task-centric physical objects


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to Haoshian Shih whose telephone number is (571)
271-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on (571)272-3963. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2196

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HSS


NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER